UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/077,054	02/12/2002	Jonathan C. Makielski	960296.98032	1596

7590 07/02/2004

Bennett J. Berson
Quarles & Brady LLP
1 South Pinckney Street
P O Box 2113
Madison, WI 53701-2113

EXAMINER	
GALVEZ, JAMES JASON	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1647	

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/077,054	MAKIELSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	J. Jason Galvez	1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *1* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Claims 1-15 are pending in the instant application, restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claim 1, drawn to protein comprising SEQ ID NO: 2, classified in class 530, subclass 350.

II. Claims 2-7, and 9 drawn to polynucleotide sequence comprising SEQ ID NO: 1, said polynucleotide sequence linked to a non-native expression control sequence, and host cells, classified in class 435, subclass 69.1.

III. Claim 8, drawn to antibody that binds specifically to SEQ ID NO: 2, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1.

IV. Claims 10-13, drawn to a method of identifying an agent that can alter activity of a sodium channel relative to a standard, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

V. Claim 14, drawn to a antibody based method of determining the presence of hH1b form of a sodium channel α subunit in a biological sample, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

VI. Claim 15, drawn to a method of determining if a human or non-human subject is at risk for Long QT syndrome, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

1. Each of inventions I, II and III are unrelated to each other. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the polynucleotides, polypeptides, and antibodies are all physically and functionally distinct chemical entities that have different structures, activities, and functions.

2. Inventions I and IV are unrelated. Invention I is a polypeptide, whereas invention IV is a method for determining sodium channel activity of a cell and alterations in activity indicating the presence of an activity-altering agent using a cell expressing the polypeptide.

3. Inventions I and V are related in that the polypeptide of invention I is detected by the method of invention V. Inventions I and V are distinct due to the polypeptide being able to be detected in materially different ways, such as by activity based assays.

4. Inventions I and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the protein of invention I is not used or defined in the method described in invention VI.

5. Inventions II and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially

different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, invention II has a separate utility such as expression of protein.

6. Inventions II and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the methods of invention V does not use the polynucleotides of invention II.

7. Inventions II and VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, invention II has a separate utility such as expression of protein.

8. Inventions III and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the methods of invention IV does not use the antibody of invention III.

9. Inventions III and V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different

process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the antibody of invention III can be used in the methods of invention V, however the antibody can also be used during purification procedures, a materially different method.

10. Inventions III and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the methods of invention VI does not use the antibody of invention III.

11. Inventions IV and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the methods of invention IV and V are different. Invention IV is not an antibody-based method, whereas invention V is an antibody-based method. In addition, inventions IV and V have different goals and outcome measures.

12. Inventions IV and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the methods of invention IV and VI are different. In addition, inventions IV and VI have different goals and outcome measures.

13. Inventions V and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions. The function of the

method of invention V is to determine the presence or absence of a specific protein, while the function of the method of invention VI is to determine risk for Long QT syndrome in human and non-human subjects. In addition, inventions V and VI have different starting compounds and different modes of operation.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the searches required for the different groups are different, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **J. Jason Galvez, Ph.D**. whose telephone number is **571-272-2935**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday 9 AM to 5 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Brenda Brumback, Ph.D.** can be reached at **571-272-0887**.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **703-872-9306**. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (toll-free).

JANET ANDRES
PATENT EXAMINER